

TSE-0027 (contd); TSE-0028

1 MR. DEE WILLIS: Next, Gerry  
2 Pollet.

3 **TSE-0028** MR. GERRY POLLET: Thanks.  
4 What started much of the concern about the  
5 import of waste was a Freedom of Information  
6 Act document we obtained a year ago that said  
7 Hanford will make receiving remote handled  
8 transuranic waste from off-site generators a  
9 priority over award fee work scope. That means  
10 a priority above Hanford cleanup work.

11 Remote handled transuranic waste is  
12 extremely radioactive. As radioactive or more  
13 so than spent nuclear fuel.

14 But it is not shipped in the same  
15 casks as spent nuclear fuel, and they are less  
16 resistant to many different types of  
17 vulnerabilities.

18 They are tested, however, and we do  
19 know that, for instance, a spent nuclear fuel  
20 cask is not designed to withstand a fire of  
21 1,400 degrees for greater than 30 minutes.

22 We also know that shipments of spent  
23 nuclear fuel and remote handled transuranic  
24 waste will go through tunnels and be exposed to  
25 many hazards that will involve fires, potential

90

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

TSE-0028 (contd)

1 fires of 2000 degrees for extended periods of  
2 time.

3 There are, we have commented on this  
4 many times in the past, that there are numerous  
5 tunnel fires involving interstate highways that  
6 burn for hours at 2,000 degrees Fahrenheit.

7 It is fallacious to say that this  
8 EIS considered either the site specific or  
9 route specific impacts of importing transuranic  
10 wastes to Hanford. Nor does it consider the  
11 terrorist attack.

12 Despite your claims, Michael, there  
13 is no model of what happens if there is a  
14 terrorist attack on one of the remote handled  
15 transuranic waste shipments.

16 Instead the EIS in one and a third  
17 page, discusses the terrorist attack and says,  
18 we actually just borrowed the analysis of a  
19 severe accident involving spent nuclear fuel,  
20 and trust us, that ought to be the same.

21 And it is not the same as a  
22 benevolent event, nor does it consider the site  
23 specific and route specific conditions. And  
24 more amazingly, what about mixed waste  
25 shipments?

## TSE-0028 (contd)

**3**

1           The accident analyses in this EIS  
2           are woefully inadequate, they assume that no  
3           one is exposed within 100 meters of the  
4           accident. And it fails to consider many of the  
5           actual chemical constituents and their  
6           immediate dangers to life and health values.

7           Astonishingly, whoever the  
8           contractor was who prepared this left blank the  
9           immediately dangerous life and health values  
10          which are known for numerous chemicals. So,  
11          this EIS is not adequate in regards to the  
12          accident consequence, and it will not be  
13          adequate in terms of lifting the injunction  
14          against transuranic waste.

**4**

15          In the event of an earthquake, the  
16          Waste Management Programmatic EIS said the  
17          number of latent cancer fatalities ranged to  
18          200 at Hanford from the quantities of  
19          transuranic waste proposed to be imported, and  
20          said that the impacts of this will have to be  
21          considered in a site specific Environmental  
22          Impact Statement, and mitigation measures taken  
23          into account.

24          Any future decisions regarding  
25          transfers of transuranic waste would be subject

## TSE-0028 (contd)

4

1 to appropriate review and the agreements DOE's  
2 entered into, and as Judge McDonald said,  
3 although DOE intends to select sites the Waste  
4 Management PEIS will not be the basis of  
5 selecting locations, and there will be a site  
6 specific review of all the impacts and the  
7 specific mitigation measures, including both  
8 the earthquake, the accidents, and the  
9 treatment required of imported transuranic  
10 waste.

11 All of those things are missing from  
12 this EIS, despite the commitment made in 1997  
13 to do those analyses and the fact that you had  
14 plenty of notice that we would obviously go to  
15 court if you didn't do them, and you know darn  
16 well you're not going to get away with  
17 importing the waste on August 1st without an  
18 analysis of those impacts.

5

19 And finally, let me just say, the  
20 Department of Energy has also asserted in  
21 Federal Court that it is exempt from Washington  
22 State and Federal hazardous waste laws for the  
23 storage of this transuranic waste.

24 If it is exempt, bizarrely, it  
25 asserts in this EIS and the Waste Management

TSE-0028 (contd); TSE-0029

5

1 PEIS that it will, all the accidents analyzed  
2 assume that the waste was treated to meet those  
3 standards.

4 You have to redo it, and you have to  
5 assume and disclose that you are not treating  
6 these wastes or give up your claim of  
7 preemption.

8 Thank you.

9 MR. DEE WILLIS: Before we go  
10 to Tim Takaro, is there anyone else that hasn't  
11 signed up but that would still like to comment?

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How many  
13 comments do you have left?

14 MR. DEE WILLIS: Just one.

15 Your name?

16 **TSE-0029** MS. ROXY GIDDINGS: Roxy  
17 Giddings. G-i-d-d-i-n-g-s. I am from Pierce  
18 County, where we take sex predators by the  
19 gross, and we take Everett's waste of their  
20 arsenic from their smelter down to our arsenic  
21 waste place.

22 We seem to be a pretty good dumping  
23 ground right there in Pierce County.

24 But I'm a downwinder. I was over in  
25 Pasco from 1945 until 1954 when I graduated

94

TSE-0029 (contd)

1 from high school. My little brother's eight  
2 years younger than I am. Do the math. He was  
3 a tiny baby.

4 And we're watching our health. I  
5 have a sister four years older. So she was  
6 only there for four years. And getting the  
7 junk that they were dumping on us.

8 I agree with all the remarks that  
9 were said and sung about this inadequate  
10 revised draft March 2003 report. This is the  
11 summary.

12 So, I was looking at it, and I of  
13 course hadn't read the whole thing. There's no  
14 way to clean up nuclear waste, and so the one  
15 thing that's good about us all being here is we  
16 are getting more education than we had before,  
17 from each other. We have to do the best we can  
18 to contain this stuff, and quit adding any more  
19 at all.

20 But I wanted to say something about  
21 a few years ago when I went to Nevada to the  
22 test site there, where they do underground  
23 testing, and none of it gets out, you know.  
24 That's why everybody's so healthy down there.

25 I watched the Indian chief get

## TSE-0029 (contd)

1 arrested for trespassing on his own  
2 reservation. That was something.

3 But on page S.37 of this summary, I  
4 just wanted to point out a couple of weasel  
5 words about mitigation here. Weasel words are  
6 like we could take, or might occur, or  
7 potential mitigation, or we could mitigate.

8 And this is in relation to how they  
9 are going to treat the tribal cultural  
10 resources that they find, they are going to  
11 determine appropriate management actions with  
12 the tribe. I thought that was nice.

13 In addition, if the mature  
14 sage-steppe habitat needs to be removed to  
15 construct a solid waste management facility, we  
16 could mitigate the habitat loss by  
17 revegetating.

3 18 I have been doing a lot of work on  
19 native vegetation. They've got a lot of work  
20 to do if they think they're going to revegetate  
21 shrub-steppe. And protecting other parcels of  
22 land, or protecting other parcels.

23 In other words, we are going to  
24 screw this place, but we're going to be real  
25 nice, we're not going to screw that place, you

TSE-0029 (contd); TSE-0030

3

1 know. If that's mitigation, it just doesn't  
2 fly.

3 Anyway, I like to hear peacocks.  
4 They are crying out there.

5 MR. DEE WILLIS: Jeanine  
6 Sedgely.

7 **TSE-0030** MS. JEANINE SEDGELY: My name  
8 is Jeanine Sedgely, with Physicians for Social  
9 Responsibility.

1

10 I do want to acknowledge and tell  
11 you that I appreciate the fact that DOE did  
12 have a public meeting in Spokane. I know that  
13 was in the plan. And that was appreciated.  
14 And believe it or not, when you do things  
15 right, sometimes people do notice. That I am  
16 afraid concludes my positive comments for the  
17 evening.

2

18 We have heard a lot in recent months  
19 about DOE's accelerated cleanup plan. And it  
20 seems to me that this is all about  
21 acceleration, and very little about any actual  
22 cleanup. The rush to get this EIS through I  
23 think is a perfect example of that. Despite  
24 numerous requests from a number of  
25 organizations, just in the comment period,



## TSE-0030 (contd)

2 1 Department of Energy's refused. It's  
2 particularly disturbing that DOE would refuse  
3 to extend the comment period, even for the  
4 Hanford Advisory Board.

5 I think this is a very ominous sign.  
6 In fact, it seems to me that DOE's accelerated  
7 cleanup plan for Hanford is actually about  
8 accelerated cleanup at the smaller sites, at  
9 Hanford's expense.

10 I concur with most of the comments  
11 given tonight. Of course we should not bring  
3 12 in 70,000 truck loads of additional waste to  
13 the most contaminated site in the western  
14 world.

15 And of course the use of unlined  
4 16 burial grounds is unacceptable, and that should  
17 be halted by the end of this year.

5 18 The groundwater monitoring is  
19 grossly inadequate, in fact, and in this EIS.

20 But I guess the biggest concern I  
6 21 have, is that I am genuinely saddened by the  
22 growing and blatant disregard that the  
23 Department of Energy has for the public  
24 process. And that frightens me as much as some  
25 of the specifics in this Environmental Impact

TSE-0030 (contd)

1 Statement.

2 And I guess I would just like to --  
3 I have a question. I don't know if you will be  
4 able to answer it. But where's the Department  
5 of Ecology tonight?

6 MR. MICHAEL COLLINS: I can't  
7 answer that.

8 MR. DEE WILLIS: Where are  
9 they?

10 MR. TIM HILL: Back here. I  
11 would be glad to make a statement, if you would  
12 like.

13 MR. DEE WILLIS: Come on down  
14 to make a statement.

15 MS. JEANINE SEDGELY: I would  
16 be glad to here if the Department of Ecology  
17 has a statement.

18 MR. TIM MILLER: My name is  
19 tube Miller with the Department of Ecology.

20 We are not prepared to make comments  
21 yet. We are going through the document. You  
22 have seen it, somebody brought it up here  
23 earlier. It is very thick. We have staff  
24 working on it.

25 As you may recall from the last

99

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

## TSE-0031

1 time, we weren't very happy with it. I think  
2 some of our comments from the last time are out  
3 there, if you want to look at it.

4 We will have comments ready by the  
5 end of the comment period, if you are  
6 interested at all in getting them then. Why  
7 don't you talk to me afterwards and I will take  
8 your name and I will send it to you. Tim  
9 Takaro.

10 **TSE-0031** DR. TIM TAKARO: Thank you. I  
11 am Tim Takaro. I am an occupational and  
12 environmental medicine physician. I take care  
13 of some of the Hanford workers who have  
14 suffered from exposures at the site.

15 Because we are in a zoo tonight, I  
16 am going to do an animal metaphor, and this is  
17 a blind man, blind people actually, and the  
18 elephant.

19 And I seem to have gotten a part of  
20 the elephant that is very long, it's about  
21 30,000 pages, and it's also very narrow. It  
22 does not include high-level waste. It does not  
23 include most liquid waste. It does not include  
24 spent nuclear fuel. It does not include  
25 nuclear reactors from the Navy. It does not

100

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

## TSE-0031 (contd)

5 | 1 include nonreactive hazardous wastes. It does  
2 not include most environmental restoration  
6 | 3 wastes that are generated as part of the CERCLA  
4 process, it does not include commercial  
7 | 5 low-level waste destined for U.S. Ecology, it  
8 | 6 does not include commercial nuclear fuel, it  
9 | 7 does not include high-level waste from other  
10 | 8 sites, it does not include TRU waste.

9 The list goes on and on about what  
10 is not in the document. Which does have an  
11 impact on what happens at Hanford. We are all  
12 in this together. And what I'm asking for is  
13 to be able to see or feel at least the rest of  
14 the elephant.

15 The focus on cumulative impacts  
16 is -- requires that we feel the whole element.  
17 Otherwise we can't possibly understand these  
18 impacts.

11 | 19 The document does note that there is  
20 a lot of uncertainty about the cumulative  
21 impacts, but it does very little towards  
22 resolving those uncertainties.

12 | 23 It talks about an upper bound  
24 scenario, which is 50 percent greater than the  
25 Hanford only scenario. But it does this in

101

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

TSE-0031 (contd); TSE-0032

12

1 terms of volume only, and not in terms of risk,  
2 risk to humans and risk to the environment.

13

3 And in order to evaluate the cumulative  
4 impacts, we need to understand the cumulative  
5 risks, not just the cumulative volumes.

6 How can we calculate cumulative risk  
7 when the risk of the current waste at Hanford  
8 is not understood?

14

9 So, I am joining the chorus, asking  
10 for the Waste Management EIS to be withdrawn,  
11 reworked, so that we can feel the whole  
12 elephant, so we can understand what the nation  
13 is expecting of all of the sites in the country  
14 that are taking waste and giving waste, before  
15 we begin to accept new waste.

16 Thank you.

17 MR. DEE WILLIS: Is there  
18 anyone else? Yes. Come forward, please.

**TSE-0032**

19 MS. BARBARA ZEPEDA: Barbara  
20 Zepeda. And I am going to say what I always  
21 say at these meetings, is tellers and  
22 international atomic energy agency page in this  
23 21 pounds of documents that says that we are  
24 beginning to address the real problems.

1

25 I don't trust my government, because

TSE-0032 (contd)

1

1 this government is spending a billion dollars a  
2 day spreading depleted uranium on other  
3 countries in the form of bombs.

4 We are worried about international  
5 terrorism. Our Department of Energy is  
6 committing terrorism on our country. In fact I  
7 suppose they are going to have to ship some of  
8 our uranium over to RUX, because they can only  
9 find precursors, and we have got all the  
10 postcursors here.

11 I think that we have a government  
12 that doesn't represent us, and that dealing  
13 with the Department of Energy is like dealing  
14 with a Patonkin village. It is just a facade.  
15 It is a pretense.

16 The Environmental Impact Statements  
17 have been a total fraud. There's not even the  
18 appearance of fairness. They don't have any  
19 intention of keeping their contracts. And when  
20 your government doesn't believe in keeping its  
21 own contracts, it's -- it loses legitimacy.

22 I think the philosophy of the  
23 current administration is that of Herman  
24 Geuring, which he said in '46 at the Neurburg  
25 trials, that a government can make the people,

103

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

TSE-0032 (contd); TSE-0033

1 clothe them in patriotism, and do anything they  
2 want with the people.

3 And this is what our government's  
4 doing.

5 I think we should be aware that  
6 McDermott has H.R. 1483 for Congress. He  
7 introduced this legislation in March to require  
8 comprehensive studies of the health and  
9 environmental impacts of depleted uranium in  
10 munitions, as well as cleanup and mitigation of  
11 depleted uranium contamination in sites within  
12 the United States where DU has been used to  
13 produce, used it or produced.

14 The Bill is entitled Depleted  
15 Uranium Munitions Study Act of 2003, and  
16 numbered H.R. 143.

17 I think we should get behind this  
18 and we should start electing a government in  
19 this country that does protect the people.

20 MR. DEE WILLIS: Anybody else  
21 like to comment on the EIS? Yes. Come down.

22 **TSE-0033** MS. PATTY SINGER: My name is  
23 Patty SINGER, and I hadn't really intended to  
24 speak, but the reason I'm here is because I  
25 grew up in Walla Walla, Washington, I was born

104

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

TSE-0033 (contd); Panel Discussion

1

1 in 1947, and I saw so many of my friends die  
2 from cancer and become really ill over the  
3 years. We can't know what it was about.

4 But I think the reason I'm here is  
5 because I really want to make a statement that  
6 we really need so desperately to take care of  
7 our entire planet, and we need to do that by  
8 being responsible citizens and being aware of  
9 what we're doing to our environment, our  
10 citizens, our friends, our family members, and  
11 our children and their children.

12 So, I think that we really have to  
13 take it seriously, and do as much as we can to  
14 make it a better world, and make it a world  
15 that all of us can live in, and be healthy and  
16 safe in.

17 Thank you.

18 MR. DEE WILLIS: Who is next?

19 Okay.

20 At the other five meetings we have  
21 had, at the end of the meetings we have had a  
22 different format, we have had an informal  
23 panel, and it's been interesting.

24 Do you want to try that? We have 30  
25 minutes left. Do you want to try it? Okay.

105

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345



Panel Discussion (contd)

1 So let's do it. At least for half an hour. So  
2 Mike, and Gerry, and Matt, is Matt still here,  
3 Matt McCormick. Matt is the assistant manager  
4 of central plateau of DOE. He is Mike's boss.  
5 And Tom Carpenter. Come on down.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Could  
7 we have a rest break first.

8 MR. DEE WILLIS: Do you want a  
9 rest break?

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

11 MR. DEE WILLIS: The restrooms  
12 are out the door to the left. Just take a rest  
13 break. When they get down here, I will tell  
14 you the rules.

15 So here is how I want to do it. I  
16 will take a question from one of you. If you  
17 want to direct the question to one of these  
18 four gentlemen, do that. You don't have to.  
19 They will get the question, they will discuss  
20 it among themselves. When they are finished  
21 discussing it among themselves, we will take  
22 another question. Is that clear?

23 I would like to go first to anybody  
24 who hasn't spoken tonight that has a question  
25 for these four gentlemen.

106

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

TSE-0034; Panel Discussion (contd)

1                   Yes, Ma'am. And speak to the mike  
2                   and give us your name.  
3                   **TSE-0034**       MS. MARY ELLEN SMITH:   My name  
4                   is Mary Ellen Smith.  
5                   I don't know a whole lot about this  
6                   whole issue, but as I sit here and listen, it  
7                   seems to me that with all the scientists we  
1                   8                   have, we ought to be able to figure out a way  
9                   to keep the groundwater from becoming more  
10                   contaminated. That doesn't seem to me like  
11                   that's rocket science.  
12                   And it seems to me that it's  
13                   something that we as members of this state and  
14                   we as members of the universe have a  
15                   responsibility to do, we have a responsibility  
16                   to our grandchildren and our great  
17                   grandchildren, and all the generations that  
18                   come after us.  
19                   So why can't you guys figure it out?  
20                   MR. GERRY POLLET:   I will take  
21                   that as a comment as well as a question.  
22                   MR. DEE WILLIS:   That is a  
23                   comment. Does anybody have a response to that?  
24                   MR. MICHAEL COLLINS:   Well, we  
25                   have started some groundwater remediation

107

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345